

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 15 remain in the application.

The Examiner has found the application to contain claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species A. Figure 1;
Species B. Figure 17;
Species C. Figure 7;
Species D. Figure 11;
Species E. Figure 10;
Species F. Figure 18;
Species G. Figure 19; and
Species H. Figure 20.

The Examiner has required Applicant under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims will be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, the Examiner contends that none of the claims are generic. Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement.

Claims 1 through 7 and 12 are readable upon species B. Claims 8 through 10 are readable upon species F. Claims 11 and 13 are readable upon species D. Claims 14 and 15 are readable upon species G. Species A through H inventions are classified in essentially the same class and subclass. Further, Species A through H inventions are related and could all be searched in one search. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute the invention of Group B, FIG. 17, claims 1 through 7 and 12.

Based on the above, it is submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance, which allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Daniel H. Bliss

Reg. No. 32,398

BLISS McGLYNN, P.C.
2075 West Big Beaver Road, Suite 600
Troy, Michigan 48084
(248) 649-6090

Date: October 26, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: 0290.00008